

November 12, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 14161

DRAFT REFORM

Draft reform has moved from a good abstract idea to a concrete possibility because of the personal commitment and leadership President Nixon is giving it. Since many Pennsylvania parents and young people are interested in these developments, I want to devote most of this newsletter to the draft.

The President's leadership.—In May, President Nixon outlined many recommendations in a message to Congress on the draft, including a youngest-first order of call, a lottery form of random selection, continuation of undergraduate deferments, and a policy review of guidelines and standards for deferments and exemptions.

When no Congressional action resulted, the President, on October 10, wrote Congress that "I see no reason why this vital piece of legislation cannot be enacted *now*," and he warned, "We have the administrative power—and we will exercise it if Congress fails to act—to make far-reaching reforms in the Selective Service System." The President was referred to a number of steps he can take by executive order, without Congressional approval, including drafting youngest first, implementing national standards, revising the deferment and exemption system, modernizing the selective service administrative system, and reforming the appeals process within the selective service.

One thing the President can *not* do, however, is to institute a lottery selection system. The 1967 Selective Service Act contained language requiring Congressional action to change the mode of selection within age groups from the oldest-first system then in effect. However, the President sent a bill to repeal this prohibitory clause to the House, which has already been approved by the House Armed Services Committee, and I am hopeful that full House and Senate approval will take place soon. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I will be doing everything I can to speed passage on the Senate side.

Student advisory committees.—One positive step which the President and current Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey have taken is set up student advisory committees in the various States to discuss the draft system, and to make recommendations for improvements and changes. As I said in a letter I wrote in September to General Hershey commending him for his student advisory plans, I am confident these committees will be fruitful. By the end of October, more than 30 states and territories have instituted these committees, and although Pennsylvania unfortunately was not included in this list, I hope the State Selective Service System will follow suit in the near future.

A new director.—The President recently announced that General Hershey, who has served long and well as Selective Service Director, will become a Manpower Advisor, and that a soon-to-be-announced Deputy Director will take over the Selective Service. I have long felt that new blood is needed to bring about the many needed draft reforms, and I look forward to working actively with the new director.

Comprehensive reform.—Early next year, I will take part in Senate Armed Services Committee hearings on the subject of detailed and wide-spread review of the entire draft system, and I look on these hearings as an outstanding opportunity for Congress and the President to work together on vital and meaningful change.

Uniformity.—One of my main efforts will be to bring about mandatory national uniform standards. For too many years, men of equal background and experience have been treated differently merely because of the geographical location of their draft boards. In a day when we have national civil service examinations, national tax laws, and national communications of all issues through

the various media, there is no reason why we do not have a truly national army. My bill, the "Draft Reform Act of 1969," includes this idea, as well as the idea of a computerized national pool of draft eligible men, and the idea of wider educational deferment policies, including vocational education, with the proviso that every deferred man spend a year in the prime eligible group.

I first became actively interested in the draft in 1965 when I discovered that Pennsylvania, which had 6% of the nation's draft-eligible men, was providing 10% of the draftees, and I will never forget my shock when in response to my complaints, a Selective Service officer came to my office with scribbled notepad figures, representing the draft "formula" in use since World War II. As a result of my inquiries, the formula was revised so that no State would have a disproportionate share of draftees, and Pennsylvania's quota dropped markedly.

My concern with this antiquated formula led to investigation in other areas of the draft, and I concluded that the entire Selective Service System needed drastic revamping. In 1967, I submitted a *mandatory* national standards amendment to the House draft bill in the Armed Services Committee, which passed both the committee and the full House, but which was watered down by the Senate-House Conference Committee to merely *authorize* national standards. Unfortunately, nothing has been done to implement these standards.

President Nixon's leadership should prove to be the ingredient to enable us to have an equitable and efficient draft system, and I hope to be able to report significant progress in the near future.

TENNESSEE WALKING HORSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the sorning of Tennessee walking horses, whereby the front feet of the horse are deliberately made sore in order to induce the desired gait, is a cruel practice. It is also unnecessary, because these horses can be trained to walk in their distinctive fashion.

I have introduced a bill to prohibit this practice and have been joined by 11 Senators. Hearings have been held on the bill, and I am hopeful of favorable consideration by both the Committee on Commerce and the Senate.

In the October, 1969, issue of Horse Show, the official publication of the American Horse Shows Association, a steward wrote of the cruelty practiced on the Tennessee walking horse. The article is vivid proof of both the cruelty involved in sorning and its undeniable existence. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WALKING HORSE CRUELTY

The following is taken from a Steward's Report with the names of those persons involved deleted.

During inspection of Walking Horses, ten minutes before the start of this class on Wednesday evening, the Veterinarian, and I, AHSA Stewart, found a mare had an open sore which was bleeding. This sore had been covered by some medication but had cracked open and blood was seeping out. I excused the mare from competition, and then was asked by the Trainer, if the lady could go into the class just for the ride. This seemed to me an odd request as all of his horses appeared to be "sore" and in no condition to show. I told the trainer to put the mare

back in the barn and not to show her again for the duration of the show.

The following I did not witness. Thursday morning early, six horsemen came to the Horse Show Office very much incensed by this same Trainer's treatment of all of his horses. They claimed he had to beat them to even get them out of their stalls. One mare fell flat after having been forced out of her stall. Then the Trainer and his grooms got her on her feet, put a rider on her, and she took three steps and fell again. She had to be helped back into the stall.

The Show Manager called me and I went over to the stable area and found the mare in serious condition; she looked to me as though she had been beaten all over. I told the Trainer he could not show any of his horses for the duration of the show.

The Manager then called the State Humane Officer who arrived a few minutes before the first class Thursday night and remained on the grounds until 1:00 a.m., checking on the Trainer and the horses under his care. He gave him three hours to get his horses off the grounds and he left the grounds just before 10 a.m. Friday morning.

What further action will be taken by the State Humane Officer, I do not know. I gave him my card and he said he would let me know, and I will so inform the Association. I expect to be called to attend a hearing on this matter.

SFR

THE UNITED STATES-THAI CONTINGENCY PLAN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, for some months the Committee on Foreign Relations has been asking the executive branch to provide the committee with a copy of a plan prepared in 1964-65 for the combined use of American and Thai forces for the defense of Thailand, one of the members of SEATO. Neither the committee nor the Senate had knowledge of this document at the time of its preparation or subsequently. The committee discovered its existence by chance when, in connection with some of its work, there was received a top secret document prepared in the Department of Defense. That Defense Department document purported to summarize the activities which the United States and its Armed Forces would undertake upon the happening of certain events.

After referring to the Rusk-Thant understanding of March 6, 1962, which assured the Thais that the United States viewed the SEATO obligation as of bilateral significance—as well as multilateral—the official document in the committee's possession outlined plans that went far beyond anything approved directly or indirectly by Congress. Indeed, after many references to the commitment involved in the plan, it went so far as to assert that the plan had special political significance because its bilateral charter represented more concrete evidence of a U.S. commitment to Thailand.

As might have been suspected, language of this kind in an official document aroused the interest of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and it sought opportunity to examine the "agreement," "contingency plan," or "understanding"—whatever it might be.

On July 14, 1969, in a public session of the committee, Secretary of State Rogers, in answer to a specific request, stated that he would procure the plan for the committee.

S14162

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 12, 1969

When the plan was not forthcoming within a reasonable period, the Committee on Foreign Relations in executive session on July 29 unanimously instructed Chairman FULBRIGHT to renew the committee request that the agreement be delivered to the committee for its examination.

On August 4, Acting Secretary of State Richardson described the document sought by the committee as a "military contingency" plan "for Thailand, developed in connection with the SEATO Treaty" and stated that the Department of Defense was "extremely reluctant to allow the full text to get out of its own hands." Secretary Laird, continued the letter, had indicated that he would be happy to provide the committee with an extensive briefing on these plans by "officers from the Joint Staff" at the convenience of the committee.

When that briefing took place on August 12, 1969, the agreement was not made available to the committee. In fact, the representatives of the joint staff were quite explicit in stating that they were without authority to show the agreement to the committee. Some committee members received an oral summary of what were alleged to be its contents.

The chairman stated that such a procedure was "not satisfactory" to him. I stated, with respect to the document being withheld, that the committee was "entitled to have it, to examine it, to determine whether or not it does, in fact, extend our commitment beyond the treaty that the Senate ratified." I added that I "was not going to be a party" to just another briefing when the committee was entitled to the document. I left the meeting.

Two days later, on August 14, I held a press conference to elucidate my view that the administration's refusal had implications far deeper than a test of strength between a congressional committee and a Cabinet department. I ask unanimous consent that my statement opening that news conference be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[A news release from FRANK CHURCH, U.S. Senator from Idaho, Aug. 14, 1969]

THE PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO KNOW

What is the Pentagon concealing? What is it in the basic nature of the military contingency plans drawn up between the United States and Thailand that cannot be revealed? Why has the Pentagon repeatedly refused to submit the plans, behind closed doors, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

We are told from all sides that there is nothing to worry about. The Pentagon assures us that the plans involve no commitment of any kind, least of all a commitment which goes beyond our formal obligation under the SEATO treaty. The President assures us that he has no intention of ordering American combat troops into another Asian country to put down a new insurgency like that which occurred in Vietnam. Even Thailand hastens to explain that it wants no foreign troops. Indeed, Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman has asserted that "local people" should fight "revolutionary wars," because foreign troops are unsuited "physiologically, psychologically and morally" for fighting wars of internal subversion. These

are strange words from a government which for so long has served as the lustiest cheerleader for our mammoth military involvement in Vietnam. Strange words they are; but I hope we will hold our Thai friends to them.

If our contingency plans with Thailand are as innocent as portrayed, why hide them? Why should their examination be so long denied to a Senate Committee which is trying, against stubborn resistance from the Executive, to discharge its basic constitutional responsibilities?

The Pentagon's refusal to submit these plans to the Foreign Relations Committee has given rise to a crisis in confidence which extends far beyond this Capital. No longer is the question confined to a contest between the Senate and the Pentagon, nor can it be resolved on the basis of whether the Committee has a Constitutional right to see the plans in its own chambers or must go to the Pentagon, hat in hand, for a peek at them. The issue is much larger: it lies between the American people and their government.

Presumably this Republic is founded upon the sovereignty of the people. But, more and more, the Executive Branch of the government behaves as though it were the master—not the servant—of the people. Our last two foreign wars have been fought by conscript armies, without benefit of a declaration of war by Congress, as the Constitution prescribes. We have been involved by Presidential decision, implemented on the spot by a huge military machine which feeds on compulsory service. The draft has become a permanent fixture in American life.

An elementary civics lesson should hardly be necessary at the highest levels of government, but the Pentagon apparently needs to be reminded that it is the Congress which is supposed to declare wars and ratify foreign commitments; that it is our young people who pay with their lives for these wars in distant lands, and our people at home who bear the burden of war taxes and war-inflated inflation.

Under these circumstances, the people have the right to know the general nature and the basic commitment involved in any military arrangements their government has entered into with the government of Thailand. Specifically, with regard to these contingency plans, the people are entitled to be told:

(1) If the contingency for which the plans are drawn is an insurgency in Thailand like that which developed in Vietnam.

(2) If, in case of such a contingency, the plans contemplate the use of American combat forces in Thailand.

(3) If, under such conditions, the plans provide for placing the American troops under the overall command of the Thai Government.

These questions do not relate to military tactics, troop levels or deployment, or to any other military matter that should properly remain confidential. These questions have to do with two fundamental issues. One is whether we are embarking, once again, upon a road that could lead to another Vietnam. The other is whether we are going to make these decisions through constitutional processes or through the devious and surreptitious means which have become all too familiar in recent years.

The American people have a right to know.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in view of these developments, and at the urging of other members of the committee, Chairman FULBRIGHT once again sought to have the original agreement sent to the committee for its examination.

On August 19, Secretary of Defense Laird wrote the committee, stating that "any member of your committee is wel-

come to come to my office and review the document."

This procedure, it seemed to me and to other members of the committee, was not only demanding, but a denigration of the constitutional responsibilities of the Senate and its agent, the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Negotiations on making this document available to the Committee on Foreign Relations have been continued since that time. With the permission of the chairman of the committee (Mr. FULBRIGHT), and in order that the historical record may be complete, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter dated September 6, which the chairman sent to the Secretary of Defense.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 6, 1969.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: With further reference to our conversation on Friday and to your letter of August 19, 1969 responding to my request on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations for a copy of the 1965 agreement between Thailand and the United States relating to United States-Thai military actions on the happening of certain events.

Your letter to me states that "any member of your Committee is welcome to come to my office and review the document." This is in essence the same position taken verbally by officers of the Department of Defense in connection with this Committee's request for a copy of the Institute of Defense Analyses study of the Tonkin incident.

In the case of the Thai document, copies of which are presumably in the possession of that government, I believe the Committee on Foreign Relations, on behalf of the Senate, is entitled to know what is in the document and related instruments. Any arrangement, plan, or agreement signed or approved by officials of the United States and a foreign government and which stems directly or indirectly from a treaty approved in accordance with our constitutional processes should, without question, be made readily available to properly constituted authorities of the United States Senate.

The Committee does not request permanent possession of these documents. Rather, we seek opportunity to examine them with the care they deserve and in order independently to confirm for the benefit of the Committee your Department's determination that the arrangements with Thailand are within the scope authorized at the time the Senate approved the SEATO Treaty.

It is not satisfactory to the Committee that this examination be undertaken by Members themselves in your office. It is essential, because of their volume, that these documents be examined by a trusted and cleared member of the Committee staff who would report to the Committee calling members' attention to portions of particular interest or significance.

If your Department's main concern is that custody of these documents should not be removed from security control, I suggest the Department of Defense bring the documents to the Committee rooms under such continuous guard as the Department believes is necessary, but with the understanding that the documents would be available here to Members at fixed times and for staff analysis as indicated above.

As you know from our public hearings, I expected the Department of State to make this document available to the Committee,

November 12, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 14163

and, of course, if this can be arranged, it would still be satisfactory.

The Committee's long-standing request for access to the Tonkin study is of a different category in that it does not relate to communications to which a foreign government is privy. It would be my expectation, however, that should my suggestion for access and study of the Thai documents be satisfactorily arranged, similar arrangements might be made for study of the Tonkin document.

In conclusion, I express the hope that these irritants to our relations with the Department of Defense may be removed along the lines I have suggested. We have both had experience in the Executive and Legislative branches of our Government and respect the constitutional doctrine of the separation of powers. It does seem to me that the requests discussed in this letter are not of a nature to justify a claim of executive privilege which I am pleased to note you have not suggested.

I hope you will find this proposal acceptable, thus enabling the Members of this Committee, on behalf of the Senate, effectively to discharge their responsibilities.

May I again thank you for a good lunch and a very interesting exchange of views.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have gone to this length in discussing the efforts of the Committee on Foreign Relations on behalf of the Senate to examine the agreement between the Thais and ourselves because this is an event that should at least be footnoted in the history books.

On last Friday, November 7, the Thai plan was finally brought to the rooms of the Committee on Foreign Relations and, with the assistance of the committee staff, examined at length and in depth by members of the committee.

Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defense Laird, after months of footdragging, have taken the proper action, and for this they should be commended. I regret, however, that the document was not forthcoming earlier, because much acrimonious debate and needless speculation might have been avoided.

It is my view that agreements, plans, or understandings—whatever they may be called—which involve arrangements between governments, and which give foreign governments expectations of what may happen in certain contingencies, are documents to which the appropriate bodies of Congress are entitled to have access.

This is a subject which needs exploration in much greater depth than I wish to undertake at this time. But it should be examined most carefully.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude by asking unanimous consent that a portion of my September newsletter to the people of Idaho—in which I attempt to put this issue into its political perspective—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletter portion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRANGE STORY OF THE SECRET UNITED STATES-THAI WAR PLANS

As one of the first Senators to protest the American takeover in Vietnam, I often have wondered whether we might have escaped our deep involvement if Congress had been told, at the start, what it later discovered in the course of its own investigations.

The lesson is that Congress must insist, from the outset, on having all the facts. I decided never again to accept the assurances of others, but to hold out for the actual evidence itself, if ever we faced the threat of engulfment in another Asian war.

So, when secret military contingency plans between the United States and Thailand were withheld from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last month, despite our repeated requests to examine them behind closed doors, I was determined that we should not acquiesce in the Pentagon's insistence that there was nothing to worry about, nor even in the President's declaration of his good intentions to avoid another Vietnam. After all, the road into the original Vietnam was paved with good intentions.

"If our contingency plans with Thailand are as innocent as portrayed, why hide them?" I asked. But Lt. General Stillwell came to the Committee with definite orders not to divulge the plans; he was to offer the customary "briefing" instead. When this became clear, I registered my objection and walked out of the meeting.

Later, at a crowded press conference, I said I no longer regarded the issue as confined to a contest between the Senate and the Pentagon. "This issue is much larger; it lies between the American people and their government."

"Specifically, with regard to these contingency plans, the people are entitled to know: (1) if the contingency is an insurgency in Thailand like that which developed in Vietnam; (2) if, in such event, the plans contemplate use of American combat forces in Thailand; and (3) if, under such conditions, the plans provide for placing American troops under the overall command of the Thai government."

Once raised, such questions couldn't be ignored. The following day, a State Department spokesman acknowledged that the plans did call for use of American combat troops in Thailand and, furthermore, that they were to be placed under Thai command!

Such an admission, I felt, would compel a repudiation. It was not long in coming. Secretary of State Rogers announced the plans would not be invoked without "consulting" Congress. Then, Defense Secretary Laird completed the *de facto* repeal of the whole arrangement, declaring it "does not have the approval of this Administration."

The Thai government retaliated by calling for the withdrawal of the 45,000 American troops now in Thailand. Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman explained that "local people" should fight "revolutionary wars," because foreign troops are unsuited for fighting wars of internal subversion. It was a surprising statement, coming from the lustiest cheerleader of our mammoth military intervention in neighboring Vietnam. But I hope we have the good sense to hold him to it.

As the month ended, it looked as if the high tide of American penetration into Thailand had been reached. At long last, the grim prospects of another Vietnam began to fade.

ALASKA RESOURCES AND THE JONES ACT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the distinguished former Senator from California, Tom Kuchel, has made a most significant contribution to Alaska's future. He has clearly pointed out the impact of the Jones Act on the cost of transporting Alaska resources to market. For years, the Jones Act has caused Alaskans to pay higher prices for goods brought to Alaska by waterborne freight. Now, the resource consumer-oriented industries recognize that the Jones Act must be reckoned with.

We are indebted to former Senator Kuchel for his help.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by former Senator Kuchel made before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. KUCHEL

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Thomas H. Kuchel. I am a partner in the firm of Wyman, Bautzer, Finell, Rothman & Kuchel, with offices in California and Washington, D.C. I am appearing today as an attorney for the Pacific Lighting System which, through its constituents, Southern California Gas Company, Southern Counties Gas Company of California and Pacific Lighting Service Company, serves the greater part of Southern California including the City of Los Angeles. All of these companies are subsidiaries of the Pacific Lighting Corporation.

The Pacific Lighting companies constitute the country's largest and fastest growing natural gas distribution system. The two distribution companies, Southern California Gas Company and Southern Counties Gas Company, provide natural gas service to more than three million retail customers, and sell gas at wholesale to supply another 470,000 customers in Southern California. These sales represent a reliable and dependable supply of natural gas to more than 12 million people at a regulated, reasonable price. The gas operations of the Pacific Lighting System trace back over 100 years, and for at least 40 years, Southern Californians have been heavily dependent upon natural gas as an energy source. In Southern California this dependence has manifested itself in the investment of billions of dollars in gas-energized appliances and equipment.

For over 20 years, production of natural gas in Southern California has been inadequate to supply the needs of the Pacific Lighting System and its customers. This circumstance has prompted the Pacific Lighting Companies to look to out-of-state sources for their natural gas supplies. The major portion of their needs traditionally has been met by interstate pipeline companies . . . in particular, El Paso Natural Gas Company and Transwestern Pipeline Company.

The purpose of these hearings is to study the situation respecting supplies of natural gas and to make appropriate recommendations. You have invited parties concerned with production and distribution of natural gas to appear and testify. I appreciate this opportunity to present the facts with respect to the gas supply problems in Southern California.

In order to provide this Subcommittee with a perspective from which to view the gas supply problems of Southern California, I shall relate some of the recent history and future prospects of the natural gas market in Southern California. In 1960, the Pacific Lighting System supplied an average of 1 1/4 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day to Southern California. Today, the Southern California market consumes more than 3 billion cubic feet of gas per day. The Pacific Lighting companies anticipate that by 1978 the consumers they serve will require an average daily supply of about 4 1/2 billion cubic feet of gas. Stating it another way, the users of natural gas in Southern California will on the average require an additional 58 billion cubic feet of gas each year.

The Pacific Lighting companies are presently engaged in a search for the most feasible means of satisfying this phenomenal increase in demand.

There is deep concern today about a coming national gas shortage. Such a shortage would be an economic, rather than a physical one. Potential gas supplies exist in the

ground in large quantities, but must be found and brought to market at reasonable prices to be useful to the gas consumer. It is most important to bring to bear all the resources we can command to assure that adequate, reasonably priced supplies of natural gas continue to be available to meet the country's growing needs.

The Federal Power Commission has addressed itself to this problem. It is studying the role that incentives might play in bringing forth greater domestic gas supplies. Gas distributors—the Pacific Lighting companies among them—are investigating the possibility that imports from Canada might help meet their supply needs.

The Pacific Lighting Companies are also carefully canvassing the possibilities of utilizing Alaska gas supplies. The American Gas Association and the American Petroleum Institute estimate that the proven gas reserves in Southern Alaska alone totaled approximately $5\frac{1}{4}$ trillion cubic feet of gas as of December 31, 1968. Some of these Southern Alaska reserves have been committed to a project to supply natural gas to Japan. This Subcommittee is aware of the recent oil and gas discoveries on the North Slope of Alaska. It is estimated that the potential supplies from all of Alaska will exceed 400 trillion cubic feet.

The essential problem with utilizing Alaska gas in the "lower 48" United States stems from the fact that Alaska is noncontiguous and remote from the market. While it is theoretically possible to move gas from the proven reserves of Southern Alaska to United States centers of population by conventional pipelines, such pipelines would be extremely expensive since they would traverse some of the most difficult terrain possible for pipeline purposes. There is, however, another means of moving this valuable resource to the market place: specifically, the movement by sea of Alaska gas in liquefied form. Existing liquefied natural gas, or LNG, technology is such that natural gas can be transported by ship from one part of the world to another. Natural gas in liquefied form takes less than 1/600th of the space it would occupy in its natural state. It is shipped in tankers especially designed to maintain liquefied gas at the required temperature of minus 258 degrees Fahrenheit. These cryogenic vessels are essentially floating thermos bottles.

A substantial amount of commerce in LNG has already developed between North Africa and markets in Western Europe. Closer to home, El Paso Natural Gas Company has recently announced plans for the importation of LNG from Algeria to the East Coast of the United States. Still closer to home, Alaska gas is being exported now to Japan by this means. No Alaska LNG is being transported to any other state of the Union. The prospects for such commerce are materially handicapped by the operation of a federal statute. That statute—known as the Jones Act—prohibits the transportation in foreign-built vessels of goods between American ports.

It is estimated that LNG vessels constructed in the United States would cost 50 to 75 percent more than vessels built abroad. This difference in costs imposes a serious handicap on the ability of Alaska gas to compete in the domestic market. This construction differential is not offset under existing federal law. The law does authorize offsetting construction subsidies for U.S. vessels built for the foreign trade.

Other cost differentials arising from the Jones Act, such as the requirement for American crews, would not impede this LNG commerce.

The natural gas industry is faced with a paradox. The "lower 48" states are experiencing a rapid growth in the demand for natural gas, while generous supplies remain untouched in Alaska. Gas consumers in Japan and other countries may ultimately reap the

benefit of these valuable Alaska reserves, since Alaska LNG can be transported to those countries in lower-cost, foreign-built vessels. On the other hand, American gas companies may find it economically advantageous to import LNG from foreign countries because such supplies can be carried in lower-cost tankers.

Mr. Chairman, Alaska Natural Gas should be available to the American consumer. We urge Congress to explore every reasonable means to achieve this goal. One way would be to provide that vessels built in the United States for the domestic LNG trade be eligible for construction differential subsidies. Another would be to provide appropriate tax incentives for construction of such vessels in domestic yards. A third alternative is appropriate modification of the construction requirements under the Jones Act. There may be other alternatives. The national interest requires that steps be taken now to assure an adequate supply of this important fuel—natural gas—for the growing domestic market.

I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee.

A FITTING TRIBUTE TO A DESERVING COLLEAGUE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on October 20, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia was singularly honored by the Davis and Elkins College when the library of that college was named "Jennings Randolph Hall." To my mind, this was a most fitting tribute, for, as a young man, the Senator served on the faculty of the school, and in his work as a Representative and a Senator he has championed the cause of education in Congress. I was honored when asked to speak at the dedication, but already committed to be out of the country.

Senator RANDOLPH remains one of the chief supporters of education programs. In the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, his counsel is most valued. He is, along with the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONROYA), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and myself, a principal sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 163, which would fund education programs at a level substantially above either last year's appropriation or this year's administration budget request.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Elkins Inter-Mountain newspaper, describing the honor bestowed upon Senator RANDOLPH, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elkins (W. Va.) Inter-Mountain, Oct. 11, 1969]

LIBRARY AT DAVIS AND ELKINS WILL BE NAMED
"JENNINGS RANDOLPH HALL" OCTOBER 20

On Monday, Oct. 20, the Davis and Elkins College Library will be named "Jennings Randolph Hall" to honor the U.S. Senator who left D&E campus 36 years ago as a 30-year-old college professor who had just won an election as a member of Congress.

Senator Randolph, who was once a faculty member and athletic director at Davis and Elkins, will be given the Founders Award at a convocation prior to the library dedication. Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education and assistant secretary for Health, Education and Welfare will

be the speaker at the convocation at 10:30 a.m. in the Memorial Gymnasium.

The library dedication will take place in front of the library at approximately 11:45 a.m. Following the dedication a reception will be held in Hallehurst Hall. College officials have extended an invitation to area residents to attend all the activities.

A photograph of Senator Randolph and a bronze plaque listing his achievements will be placed in the vestibule in the library.

The library is a two and one-half story brick structure which was built in 1959. An addition to the second floor was completed in August at a cost of \$140,000.

Senator Randolph was a member of the faculty at Davis and Elkins from 1926 to 1932. He taught public speaking and journalism, coached the debating team, and served as adviser of the student newspaper, "The Senator."

In addition to his other duties, he served as athletic director and was responsible for scheduling games with leading teams from coast to coast. It was during his tenure as athletic director that the "Scarlet Hurricanes" gained nationwide recognition for their exploits in basketball and football.

Senator Randolph was employed at Davis and Elkins during the time that James E. Allen served as president. His son, the present U.S. Commissioner of Education, was a student in one of Senator Randolph's classes.

Dr. Allen and Senator Randolph have maintained a warm friendship through the years. When Dr. Allen appeared before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee at the time of his nomination for U.S. Commissioner of Education, Senator Randolph spoke in his behalf.

Both Dr. Allen and Senator Randolph have served on the Board of Trustees of Davis and Elkins.

College officials are expecting a large number of West Virginia college presidents, newsmen, industrial executives and personal friends of Senator Randolph and Dr. Allen to attend the Founders Day activities.

TITLE V OF MDTA SHOULD BE FUNDED

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, last year I offered, and the Senate accepted, an amendment adding a new title to the Manpower Development and Training Act. This new program, supplementary State programs, was designed to give the States flexibility and freedom so that they may develop imaginative programs in the manpower area.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the Appropriations Committee in support of \$20 million, the amount requested in the administration's budget, be printed in the RECORD.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent that a description of the bipartisan package of bills enacted by the California State Legislature in 1968 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and description were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE V, SUPPLEMENTARY STATE PROGRAMS OF
THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
ACT AS AMENDED

(Statement of Senator MURPHY before the
Senate Appropriations Committee)

As the author of the Supplementary State Program of the Manpower Development and Training Act, I urge the Committee to appropriate the \$20 million budgeted by the Administration to implement this promising new manpower program.

Members will recall that we considered the extension to the Manpower Development and